

DECLARATION

Under section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (Central Act 1 of 1894), the Lieutenant-Governor of Puducherry, hereby declares that the land specified in the Schedule below and measuring 0-44-60 Ha. be the same a little more or less, is needed for a public purpose *viz.*, for the construction of multi-purpose of Community Hall in Kirumampakkam Revenue Village, Puducherry, and under sections 3 and 7 of the said Act, the Deputy Collector (Revenue)-*cum*-Land Acquisition Officer (South), Villianur, Puducherry, is appointed to perform the functions of the Collector under the said Act and directed to take order for the acquisition of the said land. A plan of the land is kept in the Office of the Deputy Collector (Revenue)-*cum*-Land Acquisition Officer (South), Villianur, Puducherry, and it may be inspected at any time during office hours.

SCHEDULE

Taluk : Bahour

No. and Name of Revenue Village: 72-Kirumampakkam.

Sl. No.	Re-survey No.	Nature of land	Name and address of the land-owners/ interested persons	Extent to be acquired		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)		
				H.	A.	Ca.
			Thiruvalargal:			
1	33/5A/3	Wet	1. Arunachalam, S/o. Kannan Chettiar;	0	44	60
			2. Vadamalai Chettiar.			
Total . .				0	44	60

(By order of the Lieutenant-Governor)

G. RAGESH CHANDRA,
Special Secretary to Government.

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

(G. O. Rt. No. 2/AIL/Lab./J/2010, dated 5th January 2011)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, the Award in I.D. No. 4/2007, dated 19-10-2010 of the Labour Court, Puducherry in respect of the industrial dispute raised by the Puduvali Mill Thozhilalargal Sangam (CITU) represented by its President against the management of M/s. Swadeshi Cotton Mills, on a demand for change of date of entry of service into the mill of 31 workers has been received;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) read with the notification issued in Labour Department's G.O. Ms. No. 20/91/Lab./L, dated 23-5-1991, it is hereby directed by Secretary to Government (Labour) that the said Award shall be published in the official gazette, Puducherry.

(By order)

G. MALAR KANNAN,
Joint Secretary to Government (Labour).

BEFORE THE LABOUR COURT AT PONDICHERRY

Present : Thiru T. MOHANDASS, M.A., B.L., P.G.D.H.R.D.I.,
II Additional District Judge,
Presiding Officer, Labour Court.

*Tuesday, the 19th day of October 2010***I.D. No. 4/2007**

The President,
Puduvali Mill Thozhilalargal Sangam,
Pondicherry . . . Petitioner

Versus

The Managing Director,
Swadeshi Cotton Mills,
Pondicherry . . . Respondent

This industrial dispute coming on 6-10-2010 for final hearing before me in the presence of Thiru Durai Arumugam, appearing for the petitioner and Thiru K. Ravikumar, Advocate for the respondent, upon hearing both sides, upon perusing the case records, after having stood over for consideration, this court passed the following :

AWARD

This industrial disputes arises out of the reference made by the Labour Department, Government of Pondicherry *vide* G.O. Rt. No. 25/2007/Lab./AIL/J/2007, dated 19-2-2007 for adjudicating the following:—

(a) Whether the demand of Pudukai Mill Thozhilalargal Sangam (RTU 126/72) against the management of M/s. Swadeshi Cotton Mills, Puducherry for change of date of entry of the following 31 workers according to the date of joining mentioned in their ESI I.D. card is justifiable or not?

(1) V. Setharanyam, (2) Dominique Kadiravan, (3) Natarajan, (4) R. Damodaran, (5) A. Vaithilingam, (6) A.J.L. Montfort, (7) Mohan Sundaram, (8) Avidapper, (9) Ramalingam, (10) Veeraputhiran, (11) Dhanakodi, (12) Lakshminarayanan, (13) Loorthumary, (14) Amsa, (15) Sambasivam, (16) Supramani, (17) G. Supramani, (18) Arumugam, (19) Shanmugam, (20) Muniyandi, (21) Ranganathan, (22) Saiyed Kadhar, (23) Sidha Nanthan, (24) Sokkanathan, (25) Periyasamy, (26) Suppurayan, (27) Gnana velu, (28) Pachivazhi, (29) Vazhar Anpazhakanthidhas, (30) Gopika and (31) Ganesan.

(b) If not, what remedies, they are entitled? Give appropriate directions.

2. The petitioner in his claim statement, has averred as follows:

The respondent mill is the one of the reputed mills in Pondicherry and there are 250 employees are working in the respondent mill. On 1-1-2005 the negotiations were held between the respondent mill and the union regarding regularisation of token numbers. The respondent mill issued a list, in which the date of joining was wrongly mentioned and it was not entered as per the real date of joining of the employees. Due to the said act of the respondent mill, the abovesaid 31 employees will affect the benefits at the time of retirement or resignation or under V.R.S. The employees union pointed out the said mistake and requested the respondent union to rectify the said mistake and enter the correct date of entry as found in the E.S.I. card of the employees. But the respondent mill has not taken any steps to rectify the said mistake. Since many of the employees are illiterate, they are not in a position to understand the said defects and they will come to know only at the time of their retirement or resignation. Hence, this industrial dispute is filed to direct the respondent mill to correct the date of entry of the said employees as found in the E.S.I. card and enter the same in the relevant register of the respondent mill.

3. In the counter statement, the respondent has stated as follows :

On 1-1-2005 the negotiations were held between the respondent and the all the unions of the respondent mills regarding various issues including the issue of regularisation of token numbers. It was agreed by all the parties to the negotiation that new token numbers would be issued on the basis of the date of entry of each worker. Accordingly, the list was prepared and displayed in the notice-board of the respondent mill and was issued to all the unions *vide* the respondent's letter, dated 8-1-2005. The unions have objected for the same and wanted separate token numbers for different categories of workmen. As this was against the signed minutes of the meeting and would lead to further confusion, the list was dropped by the respondent and effect was not given to the new token numbers.

The service and identification agreements and gratuity nominations are part of the records of the respondent mills, in which they themselves have given their particulars. Further the basic details, such as name, department, category, token number, father's name, date of birth and the date of entry of each and everyone of the workmen of the respondent mills are reproduced in each pay slip of such workmen. Each and everyone of the petitioners, who have raised the dispute have put in service of more than twenty years and have received and checked and have been satisfied with the entries in their respective pay slips for all these years. The petitioners are estopped from now raising any dispute over the entries made in the pay slip and reproduced in the list with permanent numbers. The E.S.I. card is issued to even the temporary workers, contract labourers and casual labourers. Such temporary workers, contract labourers and casual labourers cannot claim any rights based on the E.S.I. card. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the industrial dispute.

4. On the side of the petitioner, PW1 was examined and Ex.P1 to Ex.P4 were marked. On the side of the respondent, R.W.1 and R.W.2 were examined and Ex.R1 to Ex.R8 were marked.

5. *The point for determination is :*

Whether the petitioner can be considered for the date of joining mentioned in their E.S.I. card as prayed for?

6. *On the point :*

The contention of the petitioner is that the respondent mill issued a list, in which the date of joining was wrongly mentioned and it was not entered as per the real date of joining of the employees and due to the said act of the respondent mill, the above said 31 employees will affect the benefits at the time of retirement or resignation or under V.R.S.

7. In order to prove their contention, the one of the said 31 employees by name T. Ramalingam was examined as P.W.1. P.W.1 in his evidence has deposed that he was working under the respondent mill for the past 25 years as Cleaning Gang and on 8-1-2005 the respondent mill, issued a notice stating that they displayed a list in the notice-board of the company, in which the particulars regarding the date of entry and the date of birth are mentioned. P.W.1 further deposed that when he verified the same, he found that his date of entry was wrongly mentioned as 13-10-1986 instead of 18-6-1984 and for other 30 employees also, the date of entry was wrongly mentioned.

8. To prove the said fact, on the side of the petitioner, Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.8 were marked. Ex.P.1 is the notice dated 8-1-2005, which was said to have been exhibited in the notice-board of the respondent mill in which the list of employees, who were working in the respondent mill with the date of birth and date of joining of the employees. Ex.P.2 is the list of workmen of the respondent mill. Ex. P.3 is the counter statement filed by the mill before the Labour Officer. In the said counter, the respondent management has stated that the claims of the unions are unacceptable, since the demand for the change of entry is not justifiable one. Ex.P.4 series are the photocopies of the E.S.I. identity cards of the said employees.

9. The respondent has contended that on 1-1-2005 the negotiations were held between the respondent and the unions of the respondent mills regarding various issues including the issue of regularisation of token numbers. It was agreed by all the parties to the negotiation that new token numbers would be issued on the basis of the date of entry of each worker and accordingly, the list was prepared and displayed in the notice-board of the respondent mill and was issued to all the unions *vide* the respondent's letter, dated 8-1-2005 and the unions have objected for the same and wanted separate token numbers for different categories of workmen, as this was against the signed minutes of the meeting and would lead to further confusion, the list was dropped by the respondent and effect was not given to the new token numbers.

10. On the side of the respondent, the General Manager in-charge was examined as R.W.1. R.W.1 in his proof affidavit has stated that the claims of the petitioners are not maintainable, since as agreed by the unions and the respondent mill, the respondent had prepared a list of regularisation of the token numbers and new token numbers were also issued to all 222 workers of the respondent mill and the said list was also displayed in the notice-board of the respondent mill and the list was also issued to all the unions *vide* respondent's letter, dated 8-1-2005 Ex. R.2. The unions have raised their objection *vide* their letter dated 11-1-2005 to the list regarding given continuous

token numbers to different categories of workmen and the said objection is marked as Ex.R.3. R.W.1 further deposed that own service and identification agreements and gratuity nominations of the employees are part of the records of the respondent mills, in which they themselves have given their particulars and in the above list, they have not given the particulars as stated in the claim statement nor is the case of the petitioners that the same were obtained under duress. R.W.1 further stated that in the pay slips given to the petitioners every month, the token number, date of birth and the date of entry are mentioned, but the same was not objected by the petitioners for the past several years. Ex.R.4 is the pay slips of 23 employees. Ex.R.5 is the photocopy of 22 numbers of Service and Identification Form of Substitute Employees, Ex.R.6 is the photocopy of 18 numbers of Nomination Forms as per Payment of Gratuity Act and Ex.R.7 is the photocopy of 26 numbers of *Pro forma-II*. Hence, the claims of the petitioners are not maintainable.

11. The Branch Manager of ESI Corporation was examined as R.W.2. R.W.2 in his evidence has deposed that ESI card will be issued to the workmen, who is casual labour, temporary or permanent workmen those who are getting the salary up to ₹ 15,000 per month and the same was issued as per the request of the management and the management will send the declaration form, which was filled up by the employees. R.W.2 further stated that the ESI card will be issued even to the casual labourers, who are working for more than three months and even if the particular workman discontinue in his service, the same number will be continued even after he rejoins in the service and the date of joining already mentioned in the ESI card will continue.

12. The learned counsel for the respondent would contend that the management is maintaining the date of joining of the employees in the official records and as per the official records only, the permanent token numbers were given to the employees and the same was rightly displayed in the notice-board on 8-1-2005. He further contended that Ex.R.4 the pay slips will clearly exhibit the date of birth and date of entry of the employee and as per the practice of the respondent mills, each of the petitioners will have to submit Service Identification Agreement Ex.R.5, Nomination Form Ex. R.6 and *Pro forma-II* and only based on the information given by the petitioners themselves, the entries have been made in the respondent mills records and hence, the claims of the petitioners are not sustainable.

13. It is an admitted fact that the petitioners are the employees under the respondent management. The date of birth and the date of joining are mentioned in the pay slips Ex.R.4 issued to the employees of the respondent mill every month. According to the respondent

management, the petitioners were not objected the particulars regarding the date of birth and date of entry, which are mentioned in the pay slips for so many years, but only on 11-1-2005 through the unions, they have objected the same and insisted the respondent management to enter the date of entry as found in E.S.I. card. The E.S.I. card is no doubt issued to the workmen, those who are working in the respondent mill. But it is the contention of the management that the date of entry as found in E.S.I. card cannot be taken into consideration as date of joining, since they could have discontinued from the service and joined later stage.

14. It is not denied by the respondent management that the E.S.I. cards were issued to the petitioners, when they were working in the same establishment. Once the petitioners say that the E.S.I. card is issued at the instance of the respondent management, it is the duty of the respondent to prove that the petitioners were left service in a particular date and later joined in their establishment. In this case, the respondent has not taken any steps to bring any records to prove that the petitioners were discontinued their service after issuing the ESI cards to them.

15. The labour legislations were enacted to bring peace among the workers to bring more productivity in our country in the smooth circumstances. When the ESI cards were issued to the petitioners by the respondent management, the presumption is that the petitioners were working under the respondent management from the date of entry, which was found in E.S.I. card. The industrial legislations were enacted to achieve the ambitions enshrined under Articles 14 and 21 of Constitutional Law of India. The proposition laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the following cases are very relevant at this point:—

2005(3) LLN 719 (Madras):

National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Chennai Vs. Presiding Officer, I Additional Labour Court, Madras and Another :—

“The whole approach of industrial law is that the employer and employee do not stand on an equal bargaining position. Industrial law recognises that the workers are in a weaker position than the employers who have financial resources, management skills, connections etc. Hence, the whole object of industrial law is to help the weaker section in the society (the workmen) and given them protection from exploitation. There can be no estoppel against a person, who accepts his designation as an apprentice, but later on raises a plea that in fact he was not an apprentice but was doing the work of a workman.”

1982 ILLJ 33 S.C. :

Workmen of M/s. Williamson Magor and Co Limited, Vs. William Magor and Company Limited.—

“This court in the case of K.C.P Employees Association, Madras Vs. Management of K.C.P. Limited, Madras and Others reported in (1977 ILLJ 322) observed :

“In Industrial Law, interpreted and applied in the perspective of Part-IV of the constitution, the benefit of reasonable doubt, on law and facts, if there be such doubt must go to the weaker section labour. The Tribunal will dispose of the case making this compassionate approach but without over stepping the proved facts.”

16. It is admitted that the particulars given in Ex. R.5 to Ex.R.7 were entered only at the instance of the petitioners. Further it is admitted by R.W.1 in his cross-examination that the declaration form will be filled up only by the management. since some of the employees would be illiterate. From the above evidence, it is clear that the declaration forms were not filled up by the petitioners. Therefore, the argument of the learned counsel for the respondent is not hold good. The above proposition of law laid down by the superior courts were to be borne in mind to decide this case. The workers, who are from weaker section of the society, should not be exploited by the management, those who are in higher position. Hence, the relief sought by the petitioners is reasonable and genuine and the change of date of entry of the said 31 workers according to the date of joining mentioned in their ESI identity card is justifiable. R.W.1 in his cross-examination has stated that No. 1 listed in Ex.P.2 by name was retired from service, No.13, Lourdu Marie has resigned from her service and No.24 Chockanathan had died. Hence, they cannot claim any relief from this court. Therefore, the respondent is hereby directed to correct the date of entry of all the employees, except No.1, 13 and 24, listed in Ex.P.2 as per the E.S.I. Register and enter the same in the relevant registers of the respondent mill. Accordingly, this point is answered.

17. In the result, the industrial dispute is allowed and the respondent is hereby directed to correct the date of entry of all the employees, except No.1, 13 and 24, listed in Ex.P.2 as per the E.S.I. Register and enter the same in the relevant registers of the respondent mill. However, there is no order as to costs.

Typed to my dictation, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this the 19th day of October 2010.

T. MOHANDASS,
II Additional District Judge,
Presiding Officer, Labour Court.
Pondicherry.

List of witnesses examined for the petitioner :

P.W.1—11-2-2010—Ramalingam

List of witnesses examined for the respondent :

R.W.1—12-8-2010—Muthukumaran

R.W.2—23-9-2010—Maraikkar

List of exhibits marked for the petitioner :

Ex.P.1 — Copy of the notice, dated 8-1-2005 issued by the respondent mill.

Ex.P.2 — List of employees with date of entry and other particulars.

Ex.P.3 — Copy of the letter, dated 22-11-2005 issued by the respondent mill.

Ex.P.4 — Photocopy of the E.S.I. identity card of the employees.

List of exhibits marked for the respondent :

Ex.R.1 — Photocopy of the minutes of the meeting held on 1-1-2005.

Ex.R.2 — Photocopy of the notice, dated 8-1-2005

Ex.R.3 — Photocopy of the letter, dated 11-1-2005 of all the unions of the respondent mill.

Ex.R.4 — Photocopy of 23 numbers of pay slips

Ex.P.5 — Photocopy of 22 numbers of Service and Identification Form of employees.

Ex.P.6 — Photocopy of 18 numbers of nomination forms of the employees.

Ex.P.7 — Photocopy of 26 numbers of *Pro forma-II*

Ex.P.8 — Authorisation letter, dated 21-9-2010 issued to R.W.2.

T. MOHANDASS,
II Additional District Judge,
Presiding Officer, Labour Court.
Pondicherry.

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

(G.O. Rt. No. 6/AIL/Lab./J/2010, dated 6th January 2011)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, the Award in I.D.No.11/2003, dated 16-9-2010 of the Labour Court, Puducherry in respect of the industrial dispute between the management of M/s. Powerset India Private Limited, Puducherry and India Thozhir Sanga Maiyam over non-employment of Thiru E. Rajendiran has been received;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) read with the notification

issued in Labour Department's G. O. Ms.No.20/91/Lab./L, dated 23-5-1991, it is hereby directed by Secretary to Government (Labour) that the said Award shall be published in the official gazette, Puducherry.

(By order)

G. MALAR KANNAN,
Joint Secretary to Government (Labour).

BEFORE THE LABOUR COURT AT PONDICHERRY

Present: Thiru T. MOHANDASS. M.A., B.L., P.G.D.H.R.D.I.
Presiding Officer, II Additional District Judge,
Pondicherry.

Dated, the 16th day of September 2010.

I.D. No. 11/2003

The President,
India Thozhilalargal Maiyam (C.I.T.U.),
Pondicherry . . . Petitioner

Versus

The Managing Director,
Powerset India Private Limited,
Pondicherry . . . Respondent

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me in the presence of Thiru S. Parimalam, counsel for petitioner and Thiru B. Mohandass, counsel for respondent and upon perusing the case records, this court made the following :

ORDER

This industrial dispute arises out of the reference made by the Government under section 10(1) (e) of the Industrial Disputes Act in G.O. Rt. No. 81/Lab./2003/AIL/J, dated 30-6-2003, the Government made the following reference :-

1. Whether the non-employment of Thiru E. Rajendiran, is justified or not? If not, to what relief he is entitled to?

2. To compute the relief, if any, awarded in terms of money, if it can be so computed.

Today petition was called. PW.1 present. Proof affidavit filed. Ex. P1 to Ex. P16 marked, Claim proved. Petition allowed as prayed for. No cost.

Written and pronounced by me in the open court on the 16th day of September 2010.

T. MOHANDASS,
Presiding Officer,
II Additional District Judge,
Pondicherry.

Petitioner's side witnesses :

PW. 1 — E. Rajendiran

*Respondent's side witnesses : Nil**Petitioner's side exhibits:*

- Ex. P. 1 — Photo copy of settlement, dated 28-2-1997
 Ex. P. 2 — Photo copy of letter of suspension, dated 16-2-2000
 Ex. P. 3 — Photo copy of letter, dated 18-2-2000
 Ex. P. 4 — Photo copy of Notice, dated 22-2-2000
 Ex. P. 5 — Photo copy of letter, dated 14-6-2000
 Ex. P. 6 — Photo copy of letter, dated 16-6-2000
 Ex. P. 7 — Photo copy of letter, dated 26-6-2000
 Ex. P. 8 — Photo copy of letter, dated 6-7-2000
 Ex. P. 9 — Photo copy of letter, dated 12-7-2000
 Ex. P. 10 — Notice, dated 31-7-2000
 Ex. P. 11 — Photo copy of letter, dated 8-8-2000
 Ex. P. 12 — Photo copy of enquiry notice, dated 13-9-2000
 Ex. P. 13 — Photo copy of letter, dated 20-9-2000
 Ex. P. 14 — Photo copy of enquiry notice, dated 21-9-2000
 Ex. P. 15 — Photo copy of Acknowledgment, dated 28-9-2000.
 Ex. P. 16 — Photo copy of C.P. No. 36/01 with details of claim amount, dated 30-3-2001.

T. MOHANDASS,
 Presiding Officer,
 II Additional District Judge,
 Pondicherry.

புதுச்சேரி அரசு**இந்து சமய நிறுவனங்கள் மற்றும் வக்ஃபு துறை***[அரசு ஆணை பல்வகை எண் 1/இசரி/கோ.4/2010,**நாள் 2011 (வர்பு) சனவரி மீ 5 வு]***ஆணை**

புதுச்சேரி மாநிலம், புதுச்சேரி வட்டாரம், வைத்திக்குப்பம், அருள்மிகு ஸ்ரீகுரு அக்காசுவாமிகள் மடத்தை நிர்வகிக்கும் பொருட்டு அரசு ஆணை பல்வகை எண் 42/இசரி/கோ.4/2005-06, நாள் 23-12-2005-ன் மூலம் நியமிக்கப்பட்ட திரு சி. மணிவேலன் (விரிவுரையாளர், சின்னாத்தா அரசு பெண்கள் மேல்நிலைப்பள்ளி, முத்தியால்பேட்டை, புதுச்சேரி) அவர்களால் சிறப்பு அதிகாரி என்கிற நிலையில் நிர்வகிக்கப்பட்டு வருகிறது.

2. இவர் அரசுப் பணியிலிருந்து ஓய்வு பெற்றுள்ளதால் மேற்கூறிய மடத்தை செம்மையாக நிர்வகிக்கும் பொருட்டு இவருக்குப் பதிலாக வேறு ஒரு புதிய சிறப்பு அதிகாரியை நியமனம் செய்து நிர்வகிப்பது இன்றியமையாதது என்று அரசால் கருதப்படுகிறது.

3. எனவே, 1972-ஆம் ஆண்டு புதுச்சேரி இந்து சமய நிறுவனங்கள் சட்டம் 4 (1)-ஆம் பிரிவின்கீழ் வழங்கப்பட்டுள்ள அதிகாரங்களைச் செலுத்தி, புதுச்சேரி, பொதுப்பணித்துறை (நிர்ப்பாசனம்) செயற்பொறியாளர் பிரிவில் பணி ஆய்வாளராகப் பணிபுரியும் திரு கீ. செல்வம், த/பெ. கிருஷ்ணராஜ் அவர்கள், புதுச்சேரி அருள்மிகு ஸ்ரீகுரு அக்காசுவாமிகள் மடத்திற்குச் சம்பளம் பெறாச் சிறப்பு அதிகாரியாக அரசால் இதன் மூலம் நியமனம் செய்யப்படுகிறார்.

4. திரு கீ. செல்வம், அவர்கள் மேற்கூறிய மடத்தின் நிர்வாகத்தை அதன் அசையும், அசையாச் சொத்துக்கள், இதர ஆவணங்களுடன் பதவி விலகும் சிறப்பு அதிகாரியிடமிருந்து பொறுப்பேற்றுக்கொண்டு, அரசுத் துறையில் தான் வகிக்கும் பதவிக்குக் கூடுதலாகவும், 1972-ஆம் ஆண்டு புதுச்சேரி இந்து சமய நிறுவனங்கள் சட்டம் மற்றும் அதன் கீழ் உருவாக்கப்பட்டுள்ள விதிகளுக்கு இணங்கவும், தேவஸ்தானத்தின் நிர்வாகத்தைக் கவனித்து வரவேண்டும்.

5. சிறப்பு அதிகாரி நியமனம் ஓர் இடையேற்பாடு என்பதால், திருக்கோயில் தொடர்பான அன்றாடப் பணிகள் மட்டுமே சிறப்பு அதிகாரி கவனித்து வர வேண்டும். அறங்காவலர் வாரியத்தின் எடுக்கப்படக்கூடிய எவ்வித கொள்கை முடிவுகளையும் இந்து சமய நிறுவனங்கள் ஆணையர் அனுமதியின்றி சிறப்பு அதிகாரி மேற்கொள்ளக்கூடாது.

(துணைநிலை ஆளுநரின் ஆணைப்படி)

இரா. அருணாச்சலம்,

அரசு சார்புச் செயலர் (கோயில்கள்).

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

*(GO. Rt. No. 5/AIL/Lab./2010, dated 6th January 2011)***NOTIFICATION**

Whereas the Government is of the opinion that an industrial dispute has arisen between the management of M/s. Superfil Product Limited, Puducherry and Superfil Products Workers Union over refusal of employment and unfair labour practice of the workers viz., 1. A. Thiruneelakandan, 2. M. Umapathy, 3. C. Murugan and 4. S. Murugan in respect of the matter mentioned in the Annexure to this order;

And whereas in the opinion of the Government, it is necessary to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority delegated vide G.O.Ms. No. 20/91/Lab., dated 23-5-1991 of the Labour Department, Puducherry to exercise the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947), it is hereby directed by Secretary to Government (Labour) that the said dispute be referred to the Labour Court, Puducherry for adjudication. The Labour Court, Puducherry shall submit the award within 3 months from